REMARKS

Present Status of the Application

The Office Action rejected claims 1-8. Specifically, the Office Action rejected claims 1-8 under 102(e) as being anticipated by Takizawa et al. (U. S. Patent 6,573,964; hereinafter Takizawa). Claims 1-8 remain pending in the present application, and reconsideration of those claims is respectfully requested.

Discussion of Claim Rejections

The Office Action rejected claims 1-8 under 102(e) as being anticipated by Takizawa. Applicants respectfully traverse the rejections for at least the reason set forth below.

As for example, shown in FIG. 2, for one pixel structure, that is, a pixel cell has a W-like extruding structure (by two V-like structures) on the first substrate, while the other substrate has a plurality of openings 64, which are aligned along a direction from a tip of the V-like structure.

The features have been recited in independent claim 1 as follows:

> 1. A pixel structure for a liquid crystal display, the pixel structure comprising:
> a first substrate, with respect to a pixel, having ***a W-like extruding structure composed of two V-like structures formed on a surface of the first substrate, which is with respect to a top view of the first substrate***;
> an second substrate, parallel to the first substrate, having ***a plurality of openings, wherein, with respect to the top view, the openings are aligned along a direction from a tip of the V-like structures to an edge of the pixel structure***; and
> a liquid crystal layer located between the first substrate and the second substrate, wherein the W-like extruding structure abuts the liquid crystal layer,
> wherein the first substrate and the second substrate produce a multi-domain vertical alignment (MVA) structure in the liquid crystal layer (*Emphasis added*).

Likewise, the features has been recited in independent claim 7.

In re Takizawa, as shown in Fig. 1, one TFT 4 controls one pixel structure. For one pixel structure, the protrusion 10 doe not form the W-like structure in one pixel, ***as indicated in the appendix 1***. The shaded portion of the protrusion 10 does not disclose the W-like structure.

Further, in Fig. 6, the slits 20 are not arranged to be aligned along a direction from the tip of the V-like structure, ***as indicated in the appendix 2***. In other words, the slit 20 are not aligned to the tip. Fig. 6 of Takizawa does not disclose the features of the opening 64, as recited in independent claims 1 and 7, and further recited in dependent claims 2, 3, and 7.

Besides, **a plurality of openings 64** are aligned along a direction from a tip of the V-like structures to an edge of the pixel structure...

For at least the foregoing reasons, Applicant respectfully submits that independent claims 1 and 7 patently define over the prior art, and should be allowed. For at least the same reasons, dependent claims 2-6 and 8 patently define over the prior art references as well.

CONCLUSION

For at least the foregoing reasons, it is believed that all the pending claims 1-8 of the invention patently define over the prior art and are in proper condition for allowance. If the Examiner believes that a telephone conference would expedite the examination of the above-identified patent application, the Examiner is invited to call the undersigned.

Respectfully submitted,
J.C. PATENTS

Date: 3/30/2005

Jiawei Huang
Registration No. 43,330

4 Venture, Suite 250
Irvine, CA 92618
Tel.: (949) 660-0761
Fax: (949)-660-0809